Present: Silke, Mark, Karin, Ailie, Erica, Kerstin (representing EAD/EAC-CPF subteam)

1) Update from Shared Schema team (Kerstin)
- Namespace and relations discussion
  - Namespace
    - Already discussed in this group
    - Conclusion was to do the same as in EAD
    - We will discuss in TS-EAS meeting in May or in Austin, requires everyone's input
    - This is really a technical decision
  - Relations
    - We want to handle relations the same way in both standards - both relations in Relations section but also those intrinsic in description sections
      - Origination establishes relationship, for example
    - There will be (the shared schema group will take on?) an effort to disentangle references to relationships (elements that point to a related entity) - from actual descriptions of the nature of the relationship between the entities
      - Description section elements just reference the entity, but the Relations section actually describes the relationship
      - These are two ways of encoding the same information
    - Has the EAC team talked about this yet?
    - Some members do want to discuss this topic deeply; Aaron is preparing this discussion for Austin
    - Shared schema group - please bring thoughts on this to Austin meeting, maybe prepare something to share
    - Looking at EAD3 elements that establish relationships but which aren't part of relations section, and Kathy will do same for EAC-CPF - may have something to share about this for next whole committee meeting
    - Kerstin will join July EAC-CPF meeting too to prepare for Austin
    - Gerhard has his own ideas about relations and wants to discuss in Berlin next March (he can't be in Austin) - it will be finalized there
- Will have update for whole team meeting in a few weeks, as all groups will
2) Topics of the month (all)
- Content becomes value: #5, #6, #7, #8
  - Convert values of <maintenanceStatus>, <publicationStatus>, <agentType>, and <eventType> to attribute values - @value
  - No comments against this idea except for Kathy, who wonders if this will open up possibility of conflicting values between attribute and element
  - Any concerns?

- ■ Karin: We should follow EAD3
- ■ Mark - there is a question of whether that element should contain text at all - it doesn't have to, but EAD3 allows it so we might as well
  - ● With dates in EAD, you can have completely different values between attributes and values (this is not ideal)
- ○ This allows more descriptive text in the element, with controlled language in the attribute
- ○ Also allows for different languages
- ○ **The group decided in favor of this proposal**
● Data value standard attribute: #14, #15 (esp. latest comments)
- ○ We removed regex pattern in agencyCode in phase 1
- ○ How to encode this information?
- ○ Mark and Karin: Having a schematron check like in EAD3 is a good option
- ○ In APE is there an attribute in EAG to identify if the agencyCode is ISIL or not?
  - ■ APE essentially uses localType without predefined list
- ○ What about a specific field for ISIL?
  - ■ Something more open would be better, if a new standards comes around
  - ■ @agencyCodeType: could be used but narrows to this specific element. Maybe there is a need for a more abstract attribute, useful for several elements (see below)
- ○ Silke: Do we have this issue of defining data type with other elements as well, or just agencyCode?
  - ■ Probably?
  - ■ Maybe an attribute like @dataType that could be used in several elements - wherever we want to identify this
  - ■ Mike from EAD3 perspective: use localType to leave it as open as possible, or use very specific attribute for each element
  - ■ Silke argues against @localType
  - ■ Karin - would be nice for EAC-CPF and EAD3 to be aligned, from schema point of view
- ○ Silke: EAD3 solves this with schematron, but for EAC-CPF agencyCode is more important, plays a different role
  - ■ We see a need to identify this agencyType quality
  - ■ Karin: this is part of control, and control should be the same for EAD and EAC-CPF
    - ● Identify which standard you're using in control, and then if you specify ISIL the agencyCode will be checked against it, though really there is no way of checking to see if it's actually a registered ISIL code
- ○ Maybe an attribute that is yes or no - registered code or not
  - ■ Kerstin - this is really a second question - first an attribute that says where you are getting the information, and then a yes/no whether that information is registered

- One @codeOrigin, and one @registered or @authorized
- Or, merged values in one attribute
  - Kerstin: someone should come up with a list of elements and attributes in EAD and EAC-CPF would have a similar problem to solve
    - Karin will try to do it but can't start until June - she won't be at the next meeting but will report out via email or through Kathy
  - Mark: this is also really important for EAD, not just EAC-CPF
  - Silke: we can't decide here, let's ask Kathy to include that topic in the identifiers discussion and talk about it in Austin
    - Issues are commented by Kerstin and assigned to Kathy to care about
  - **The group did not come to a decision on this**

3) Any other business (all)
  - None

4) Next meeting
  - planned: Friday, 7 June 2019, same time